

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 are amended. Support for the amendments is found at least at page 8, lines 5-21, of the Applicants' specification. No matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based upon the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Loving and Examiner Moise in the March 27, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,862,583 to Mazzagatte et al. (hereinafter "Mazzagatte") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0042880 to Endoh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, that job data files are divided into a plurality of parts and that data corresponding to the part stored on the second storage device is not stored on the first storage device. At least this feature cannot reasonably be considered to be taught, or to have been suggested, in Mazzagatte.

During the personal interview, Examiner Loving asserted that Mazzagatte, col. 5, lines 52-65 discloses distribution of job data files. However, what is disclosed in Mazzagatte is sequentially loading program instructions into a CPU. Mazzagatte does not disclose that data is split into two parts and only one part remains on the hard drive. Instead, Mazzagatte discloses that program instruction sequences are loaded into a CPU. Mazzagatte does not disclose that the stored program instruction sequences are divided in two parts, each part being stored on a different storage device. As acknowledged during the personal interview, col. 5, line 52 - 56, cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, that data corresponding to the part stored on a second storage device is not also stored on the first storage device, as positively recited in claim 1.

The Office Action concedes that Mazzagatte does not teach a deletion controller for deleting part of the job data stored in the storage device, when a prescribed deletion condition is satisfied, as recited in claim 14, or deleting a portion of data of the job data that is stored in the second storage device when a prescribed deletion condition is satisfied, as recited in claim 19. The Office Action relies on Endoh to overcome this deficiency of Mazzagatte.

The Office Action refers to paragraphs [0137], [0138], [0162], [0164] and [0165] of Endoh as allegedly disclosing features that correspond to the claimed deletion controller. However, these paragraphs describe cancellation of an entire print job. Additionally, several paragraphs referenced by the Office Action do not address this feature. For example, paragraphs [0137] - [0138] of Endoh describe closing a user interface screen on the LCD on the Endoh device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the authenticated secure printing system disclosed in Mazzagatte is not combinable with the management method for peripheral equipment disclosed in Endoh. Specifically, the subject matter of the pending claims is directed to controlling deletion of data, in parts, from a device, and not to regulate the number of jobs and preventing the deterioration of performance, which the Office Action cites as the motivation for combining these references in the manner suggested. The conclusory statement that the motivation, which is not related to any objective of the subject matter of the pending claims, does not meet the standard required for such a showing as set forth in either the MPEP § 2143.01 or under Federal Circuit precedent.

In summary, Mazzagatte and Endoh are not combinable in the manner suggested by the Office Action. A proper motivation to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Office has not been shown. Finally, even if the references were combinable as asserted in the Office Action, the references, cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or even to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in at least independent

claims 1, 14 and 19, as discussed above. Further, claims 2-13 and 15-18 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by any permissible combination of the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on allowable independent claims 1 and 14, as well as for the separably patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzagatte in view of Endoh, are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-19 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:GMH/scg

Date: April 17, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--